



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/829,151	04/09/2001	Alan Young	47185-95330	8242

7590

03/10/2006

Arter & Hadden LLP

One Columbus

Suite 2100

10 West Broad Street

Columbus, OH 43215-3422

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, TAN D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3629

DATE MAILED: 03/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/829,151	Applicant(s) YOUNG, ALAN	
	Examiner Tan Dean D. Nguyen	Art Unit 3629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 October 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7,9 and 10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 9-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The amendment filed 10/12/05 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132(a) states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: claim 1, 1st step of "selecting a KPI to monitor". There is no support for "selecting" and "to monitor".

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

Claim Status

Claims 1-7, 9, 10 are active and are rejected as followed. Claim 8 has been canceled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

3. **Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.**

In order for the claimed invention to be statutory subject matter, the claimed invention must fall within one of the statutory classes of invention as set forth in § 101 (i.e. a process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter).

In the present case, Method claim 1 is directed to a "method for reporting a value of a key performance indicator", which is not within one of the classes of invention set forth in § 101.

The “method for reporting a value of a key performance indicator” comprising the steps of:

- (a) identifying a key performance indicator (KPI),
- (b) indentifying at least one business event associated with the (KPI)
- (c) receiving a business event message ... ,
- (d) determine the value of the (KPI) based on the business data, and
- (e) displaying the determined value of the (KPI) via a contextual visualization interface”,

are merely a disembodied abstract idea and do not produce a (1) useful, (2) tangible, and (3) concrete result. The result of the instant invention is one or more numbers (value) displayed on a contextual visualization interface. The number (value) might be considered “useful” in reporting a key performance indicator (prediction).

However, § 101 requires that the result be reproducible or repeatable (tangible and concrete). See In re Swartz, 232 F.3d 862, 864, 56 USPQ2d 1703, 1704 (Fed. Circuit 2000). In the instant case, it’s not clear how the most important step “determining the value of the key performance indicator based on the business data” is carried out?

There is no citation in the specification of how this step is carried out and no example has been cited. Applicant’s response of 10/12/05, on page 7, that this step “*may be performed in any appropriate manner*”. In other word, the step of “determining the value” is subjective and can be carried out any way or step, depending on each circumstance, which indicates that the value is changeable, unpredictable or irreproducible, varying depends on event, event message, occurrence, system, person,

etc. The claim is broad to include determining by human being which produces results which are subjective and irreproducible. This fails to meet the test that the result has to be concrete to meet the § 101 test. Moreover, there is no physical transformation of anything to another state or thing even though this is dispositive. Therefore, claims 1-7 are thus drawn to the abstract idea of identifying an indicator and determining the value of the indicator and displaying it on a medium, rather than to a practical application of the idea as required by 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 1-7, 9, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

6. Claims 1-7, 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a method for reporting a value, does not reasonably provide enablement for (d) determining the value of the key performance indicator (KPI), based on the business data above. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to practice the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. Pages 17-18 and Fig. 3 have been reviewed but there is no citation of how to carry out step (d) or any example of how the value can be determined. Moreover, What is the relationship

of these variables: (1) business event, (2) business event message and (3) an occurrence of the business event to the step of "determining the value of the KPI" or in other word, are these variables being used in determining the value of the KPI? Again, there is no demonstration or example of how these variables related to the determining of the KPI. Note that in a method claim, elements or steps are normally related or congruent and can not be presence in the claim and hanging loose.

7. In claims 1, 9 and 10, it's not clear how the step of "determine the value of the key performance indicator based on the business data" is carried out or how the value is obtained since "based on the business data" and related to the previous step with respect to "occurrence" is not clear and definite. The mere change from "the occurrence" to "an occurrence" does not resolve the rejections above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. The factual inquiries (4) set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill (artisan) in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness/unexpected.

10. Claims 1-7 (method), 9 (system) and 10 (apparatus) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over COOK (US Patent 6,546,378).

As for independent method claim 1, COOK discloses a method for reporting (or displaying) a value of a key performance indicator (prediction), comprising:

a) identifying a key performance indicator (or KPI) (prediction) {col. 39, example 3, "stock market prediction", i.e. stock price prediction};

b) identifying at least one business event associated with the KPI (prediction) {see col. 39, lines 34-67}

c) receiving a business event message (data) indicating the occurrence of the business event and describing the business event {see col. 39, line 43 col. 40, line 4;

d) determining the value of the KPI (prediction) based on the business data {see col. 40, lines 4-48, steps 4-9}; and

e) displaying the determined value of the KPI (prediction) via a contextual visualization interface (monitor/screen display) {see Fig.1, element 42 (computer display screen), or element 44 (printer)} {also, see example 3 on cols. 39-40, or example 11 on col. 45, for teachings of steps (a)-(e) above with other prediction dealing with weather forecast such as whether it will rain in San Francisco in two days}. COOK fairly teaches the claimed invention except for some relationship between the occurrence of event and the message (data). However, on example 12, step 7 on col. 40 (or similar teachings on col. 46, step 8), COOK fairly teaches the determination of the relationship between different types of events (occurrence) or the determination of different maps to predicted different features of IBM stock for different periods into the future using different

Art Unit: 3629

collections of market measures and by analyzing wave packets of different lengths, therefore, it would have been obvious to a skilled artisan in the data analysis and management to link business event message indicating the occurrence of the business event to the determination of the value of the prediction if desired, as fairly taught in COOK above.

As for dep. claims 2-6 (part of 1 above), which deals with well known data event parameters, i.e. different type of event features such as reference, change, threshold event, task completion or failure, etc., these are non-essential to the scope of the claimed invention which is "data analysis and management" and are fairly taught in example 12, col. 46, "... *relationship between different types of events*".

As for dep. claim 7 (part of 1 above), which further limits the KPI, a prediction and the determining step using a predictive logic, these are taught in Examples 3 or 11 above and col. 13, lines 1-5.

As for independent apparatus claims 9 and 10, which are merely system/apparatus to carry out the method of claim 1 above, they are rejected over the system/apparatus to carry out the method of claim 1 as rejected above and further in view of system/apparatus disclosed Fig. 1 (10) or col. 10, lines 27-67.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's main arguments (3) filed 10/12/05 with respect to the examiner's rejections have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

(1) Applicant's comment with respect to the 101 rejections have been responded as cited in paragraph 3 above.

(2) Applicant's comment with respect to the 112 rejections have been responded as cited in paragraph 6 above.

(3) Applicant's comment with respect to the 103 rejections are not persuasive in view of the paragraph no. 9 cited above which discloses the location of teachings of steps (a)–(e) in COOK, especially as cited in example 3, cols. 39-40, and examples 11 and 12, cols. 45-46.

Conclusion

12. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See US Patent 5,889,993; 5,832,467; US 2001/0001149 and 2003/0055759 for similar teachings with respect to data analysis and management including the step of calculating a predicting value or future value (future trend) based on historical data.

No claims are allowed.

Art Unit: 3629


14. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct@uspto.gov>. Should you have any questions on access to the private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll free).

In receiving an Office Action, it becomes apparent that certain documents are missing, e. g. copies of references, Forms PTO 1449, PTO-892, etc., requests for copies should be directed to Tech Center 3600 Customer Service at (571) 272-3600, or e-mail CustomerService3600@uspto.gov.

Any inquiry concerning the merits of the examination of the application should be directed to Dean Tan Nguyen at telephone number (571) 272-6806. My work schedule is normally Monday through Friday from 6:30 am - 4:00 pm. I am scheduled to be off every other Friday.

Should I be unavailable during my normal working hours, my supervisor John Weiss may be reached at (571) 272-6812. The FAX phone numbers for formal communications concerning this application are (703) 872-9306. My personal Fax is (571) 273-6806. Informal communications may be made, following a telephone call to the examiner, by an informal FAX number to be given.

dtn
March 3, 2006


DEAN T. NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER